

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respond herein to the Official Communication mailed December 30, 2008 in the above-identified patent application, wherein Examiner has requested restriction between claims 1-25 and claims 26-30.

By the present Amendment, effectively, applicant has elected claims 26-30, by rewriting claim 26 as claim 1 (and also leaving intact the recitation of claim 1 concerning the construction of features of the “rotor”, as such).


Examination of claims 1-25 and 27-30, all of which are directed to the elected filter-rotor combination is earnestly solicited.

Insofar as the Office Action, at page 2 indirectly asserts that claim 1 is anticipated by Schwartzman (4,607,665), it is noted that there is no rejection of any claim, as yet, on prior art. Besides, the Amendment herein renders that remark regarding claim 1 moot.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application claims, as amended, on the merits, and to allow the same in due course.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING  
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY  
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
EFS FILING SYSTEM  
ON JANUARY 27, 2009

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MAX MOSKOWITZ  
Registration No.: 30,576  
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8403  
Telephone: (212) 382-0700